LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH R.P.D.

THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN Ivor Montagu

BRITAIN AND GREECE N. Zachariades

ENGELS J. B. S. Haldane

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY R. Page Arnot

ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A. Jacques Duclos

POSTCRIPT—RESOLUTION OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF U.S.A.

MESSAGES FROM INDIA, BURMA, CEYLON

BOOK REVIEWS

THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

6D

AUGUST 1945

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVII. No. 8

CONTENTS

August, 1945

Page

Notes of the Month—*Britain Moves Left* by R. P. D. 225

The Election Campaign by IVOR MONTAGU 231

Britain and Greece by N. ZACHARIADES 234

Engels by J. B. S. HALDANE, F.R.S. 235

Twenty-five Years of the Communist Party by R. PAGE ARNOT 236

On the Dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States by JACQUES DUCLOS 239

Postscript—Resolution of C.P.A. of U.S.A. 250

Messages from India, Burma, Ceylon 252

Book Reviews—

Indian Problems by MICHAEL CARRITT 256

U.S.S.R. Geography by Q. 256

Publications Received

BOOKS

Hitler and His Gang by Boris Efimov (Cartoons) (Alliance Press Ltd., 2*s* 6*d*, 78 pp.).
Eduard Benes by Philip Paneth (Alliance Press Ltd., 8*s* 6*d*, 127 pp.).
The Struggle for French Democracy by Cyril Claydon (Lawrence & Wishart, 5*s*, 138 pp.).
The Civil Service and the People by R. W. Rawlings (Lawrence & Wishart, 7*s* 6*d*, 162 pp.).
Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work. 1943 (Columbia University Press, N.Y. 5.00 dols , 491 pp.).
Building and Planning by G. D. H. Cole (Cassell & Co., 10*s* 6*d*, 286 pp.).
Guide to the New Age by Kenneth Ingram (Allen and Unwin Ltd., 7*s* 6*d*, 192 pp.).

PAMPHLETS

Communist M.P. (Communist Party, 3*d*, 32 pp.).
Where's That Fact (Communist Party, 3*d*, 20 pp.).
The Case for Nationalisation and Control (Labour Research Department, 1*s*, 62 pp.).
Coal—Facts from the Reid Report (Labour Research Department, 6*d*, 16 pp.).
Engineers and Reconstruction (Labour Research Department, 6*d*, 32 pp.).
Houses for the People (Labour Research Department, 1*s*, 56 pp.).
Health and Safety Committees in Industry (Socialist Medical Association and L.R.D., 6*d*, 12 pp.).
Poland's Case by Dr. Stefan Litauer (Russia Today, 3*d*, 16 pp.).
Talking to Some Purpose, B.F.Y.C. Discussion Booklet No. 2 (British Federation of Young Co-operators, 1*s*, 38 pp.).
Thomas Paine by Chapman Cohen (Pioneer Press, 1*s* 3*d*, 52 pp.).
Labour's Case for Public Ownership and Control (Marx House Discussion Guide) (Marx House, 3*d*, 24 pp.).
The March of Yugoslavia by Edvard Kardelj (United Committee of Yugoslavs,6*d*, 28 pp.).
The Liberation of the Yugoslav Littoral (United Committee of South Slavs in London, 6*d*, 32 pp.).
Answers to Questions by Harry Pollitt (Communist Party, 1*s*, 48 pp.).
Railways for the Nation (Labour Research Department, 6*d*, 32 pp.).
Artillery—God of War by Lt.-General I. S. Prochko (*Soviet News*, 1*s*, 64 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Britain Moves Left

JULY 5, 1945, will rank with V Day for the people of this country as the sign of a great liberation. V Day was the day of military victory over fascism. July 5 was the day of electoral victory over Tory reaction, the half-brother of fascism. This verdict of the people has swept aside all the predictions of the prophets and the calculations of reactionary intriguers. With singular thoroughness the electors have made short work of the Tory "Caretaker" "National" Government, inflicted defeat at the polls on thirteen Cabinet Ministers or Ministers of Cabinet rank and sixteen other Ministers (including Amery, Grigg and Bracken—Simon, Halifax and Hoare not being available) and purged Parliament of 187 of the 251 Tory M.P.s who voted for Munich, including the removal of such well-known figures as Lord Dunglass, Major Petherick, Sir Herbert Williams, Captain MacEwen, Wardlaw-Milne and Erskine Hill. A grand clearing-out operation has taken place. At last the turn of the Labour Party has come, for which generations of the labour movement have worked and waited, to form a Labour Government with a parliamentary majority. A new political situation opens.

1945 Is Not 1918

This glorious political leap forward in Britain is the sequel of military victory in the people's war of the United Nations against fascism. The contrast between 1918 and 1945 is inescapable. In 1918 the snap election following on victory in a reactionary imperialist war produced the Parliament of "hard-faced men," of Tory profiteers, whose ascendancy was to continue almost unbroken for twenty-seven years. In 1945 the snap election following on victory in a progressive war of liberation against fascism destroyed that Tory majority after twenty-seven years of domination and produced the first Labour majority. For a parallel to such a landslide it would be necessary to go back forty years to the election of 1906, which swept away ten years of Tory domination, returning the Liberals with a coalition majority of 354 seats. That 1906 leap forward was the sequel of the Russian Revolution of 1905, whose reflections spread through Europe and the world. The 1945 leap forward is the counterpart of the sweep to the left throughout Europe, following victory over fascism, the alliance with the Soviet Union, the tremendous role of the Soviet Union and the resistance movements in the struggle, the triumph of the Left in the French municipal elections, and the formation of new democratic Governments with communist representation in the majority of European countries. All over the world this popular election victory in Britain is hailed with joy.

A Blow to Fascism

For fascism and the friends of fascism in Germany and all over the world this popular election victory in Britain comes as a blow to all their hopes. The Nazis whisper into the willing ears of the *Daily Mail* that the electoral verdict of the British people is an "awful mistake":—

> The Germans are just dumbfounded that Britain should have deserted Mr. Churchill.
>
> "To me it sounds like awful ingratitude and a mistake," a retired Wehrmacht officer said to me. "We Germans think now that Mr. Churchill is one of the greatest men in the world, and if he had been our leader we certainly should not have turned him out after what he has done. It's really most puzzling."

The ingratitude of the British people to Mr. Churchill is the theme of every fascist journal. Similar lamentations echo from the press of Franco and Salazar and the Greek Royalists and quislings.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tory Fiasco

No greater blunder was made by the entire inept Tory election campaign than the attempt to imitate the tactics which Lloyd George had used with masterly, if unscrupulous and ultimately suicidal cunning, in 1918. Thereby Toryism revealed how completely it had failed to understand either the character of the war or the temper of the people. Even the art of the swindle had become stereotyped and lifeless in the hands of the present exponents of Tory degeneration. With slavish plagiarism the would-be smart boys of the Tory machine, the Brackens and Beaverbrooks, sought to imitate all the outward trappings of the Lloyd George success—the snap election called within a few days of the victor celebrations, the coupon letter, the "national" appeal, the noisy parade of "the man who won the war." Only one thing was lacking—an ounce of political understanding of the present, in place of rummaging in the precedents of the past.

Museum Antiquities

The Beaverbrook - Bracken - Churchill election technique, despite the use of the most modern machinery of technical methods (especially broadcasting) was oddly antiquated in political content. They solemnly sought to exhume all the exploded stunts and scares which had done good service in previous elections but had now become comic opera jokes, and were genuinely surprised when their most hair-raising efforts were received with ribald laughter. They sought to stage a grand constitutional crisis about the constitution of the Labour Party, which might have aroused the mild interest of Mr. Gladstone or Lord Palmerston, but stirred not a ripple in an electorate grimly intent on houses and post-war employment. The more they paraded the methods of the circus and the stunt, the more they repelled the electors. They really appeared to believe that the millions of men and women who had been through the fires of war against fascism were the same as the holiday crowd which had cheered Munich, and could be as cheaply fooled. July 26 undeceived them.

Irresponsible Adventurism

The electors did well to reject decisively, not only the Munichites and Tory Diehards, but equally the irresponsible adventurism of the Beaverbrook-Bracken-Churchill trio, which appeared to treat politics as a succession of stunts, showed no grasp of or concern for the serious problems of British reconstruction, and could coolly proclaim, as in Bracken's speeches, that the basic industries of Britain did not matter, and that all that was necessary was a few luxury industries and ever extending "service" occupations—in short, to complete the transformation of Britain into a pleasure-park for the international rentier and the American tourist. From this characteristic final policy of Tory degeneracy, with its accompanying riot of political adventurism and gambling with the future of the people, the healthy sense of the electors has saved Britain.

No Illusions

Does this clumsy electoral technique of the Tory machine in the present election, or the undoubtedly powerful advance of public opinion from the shame and bankruptcy of a quarter of a century of Toryism, mean that Toryism is finished as a political force? It would be obviously premature to draw any such conclusions. Toryism still mustered ten million votes, or two-fifths of those voting. The deceptive electoral system, operating this time in favour of the Labour Party, exaggerates the reduction of Tory strength in terms of parliamentary seats; but the same fickle electoral

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system could, with a relatively small turnover of one million votes, reverse the position. The political machine of Toryism is bound to be renewed and reorganised in the light of the lessons of the Beaverbrook bungle. The great propertied interests behind Toryism remain powerful, and will use their power to weaken and hinder the execution of the Labour programme, and to exploit every difficulty with a view to throwing discredit on the Labour Government and the Labour majority. A very great consolidation of Labour and progressive forces is thus essential to safeguard and make lasting the victory over fascism.

Liberal Eclipse

Liberalism also suffered in this election a defeat of its plans to achieve a great revival and become the balancing force in politics. Out of 307 candidates only 11 were returned, halving its already low representation in the last Parliament. The fate of this party, which less than forty years ago won 380 seats; or very nearly the equivalent of the present Labour Party total, and now has sunk to 11 seats, is a lesson to all those who seek to bridge the gulf of the class struggle with empty conciliatory phrases. The final battle is between Toryism and Marxism. The Liberal Party, under Sinclair and Beveridge, aspired to an independent role, rejected the aim of the united progressive front, dreamed pipe-dreams of becoming the balancing party, and offered the electorate an unsustaining diet of "Neither . . . nor" "On the one hand . . . on the other," "Neither capitalism nor socialism," "Neither private enterprise nor nationalisation," etc. The electorate rejected this nauseous concoction of emptiness with alacrity.

Progressive Unity

Nevertheless, this catastrophic defeat of Liberal aspirations to a leading independent political role should not give rise to illusions that Liberalism is yet finished as an element in the political life of this country. Once again the weighted electoral system gives a fantastically unjust representation of Liberalism in Parliament, so that it takes 207,000 Liberal voters to have one M.P., as against 30,000 Labour voters and 46,000 Tory voters. The Liberal vote of two and a quarter millions represented an increase of three-quarters of a million on the last election; and if this were extended from the three hundred constituencies contested to the full six hundred and over, it might possibly represent four million Liberal voters in the country. Such an element, which still has its social basis for existence, has a claim to play its part in the political life of the country, but only within a wider popular combination, in which the leadership must necessarily lie with the organised working-class.

Lesson of the Polls

In the final aggregate vote for the 627 seats announced on July 26, Labour obtained 11.9 million votes out of the total 24.9 million votes cast, or 48½ per cent.; the Tories (including Conservatives, National or Liberal National) 9.9 millions or 40 per cent.; and the Liberals 2.2 millions, or 9 per cent. On this basis Labour has received 390 of 627 seats or 62 per cent., the Tories 210 seats, or 33 per cent. and the Liberals 11, or under 2 per cent.; and Labour has an effective parliamentary majority of over 140 over all others. On the face of it, the tactics of electoral isolation of the Labour Party and refusal of any progressive alliance have been crowned with success at the present stage in winning the absolute Labour majority desired (possibly to the surprise of some of its authors) and will therefore for the moment have all the prestige of success. The fact, however, that a Labour vote of just under half the total could secure three-fifths of the seats does not prove that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour and progressive unity could not have inflicted a still more overwhelming and decisive rout on Toryism and won a more broadly based electoral majority.

Two Party System

Public opinion tests immediately preceding the election indicated that the biggest popular support would have been for a Popular Front against Toryism. Thus the Gallup Poll in May, 1945, found that a Popular Front of Labour, Liberals, Communists and Common Wealth would have immediately, even before any election campaign, won 55 per cent. of the population; while in the event of parties contesting separately, the Gallup Poll in June, 1945, found 45 per cent. for Labour and 37 per cent. for the Tories. The decision of the Labour Party Conference in May, narrowly rejecting consideration of unity by 95,000 votes, and indicating overwhelming rank and file support for unity where organisations had taken the opinions of their membership, cast the die and determined the character of the election. This decision meant that the effective choice of the election would be between Toryism and Labour, with virtual elimination of other parties; and that if the electorate wished to clear out the Tories, they would have to vote Labour or run the risk of losing their votes by division. The Communist and Common Wealth Parties recognised the position by withdrawing the majority of their candidates, contesting mainly in constituencies difficult for themselves, and supporting Labour elsewhere. The electorate recognised the position by voting overwhelmingly for Labour as the effective alternative party to defeat the Tories, and with rare exceptions ignoring other parties or reducing them to a low vote. Under these conditions the Labour vote rose from the 45 per cent. available in early June to 48½ per cent., though not to the 55 per cent. or over available for the Popular Front. It was a close gamble; but under the conditions of the electoral system it came off.

Pendulum or Permanence ?

Before assuming that this success has settled the issue for all time, disproved the demand for Labour and progressive unity in the recent election as misplaced or superfluous, or disposed of the case for democratic electoral reform, Labour supporters will do well to consider more fully the conditions of the problem and the possibilities of future political developments. Tory opinion, especially moderate Tory opinion like *The Times*, has hailed with especial emphasis the re-establishment of the two-party-system as the main gain of the election, and heaved an obvious sigh of relief. The grounds for their satisfaction are transparent. They assume with confidence as the necessary concomitant of the two-party system the "swing of the pendulum," and therefore the automatic future return of Toryism. They assume a long period of peaceful alternation of Toryism and Labour, reproducing the classic nineteenth century parliamentarism, preventing the execution of any long-term Labour programme and guaranteeing the maintenance of the *status quo*. This is obviously not the outlook of Labour supporters. We desire the permanent ascendancy of the labour movement, leading the majority of the nation in a basic social reconstruction, and reducing to impotence and final disappearance Toryism. This will require a broader basis of support than the present 48½ per cent., whatever the form in which it may be realised. The full establishment of working-class unity in the political field will be more than ever essential, and it may also be necessary to consider in the future new forms of broader unity or association with the labour movement.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communism in the Election

It is in the light of this general political situation governing the election that the role of the Communist Party in the election must be seen. The main task of the Communist Party was to rally unity behind Labour for the defeat of Toryism, while at the same time striving in a limited field for increased Communist representation. In the conditions of the election the effective choice before the mass of the electorate was between Toryism and Labour, with little room for secondary contestants. Hence the visible direct electoral results won by Communism were small and not a measure of its real political strength. The foremost campaigning work of the Communist Party during the ten years between the elections, as well as during the election, in exposing Munichism and Toryism and rallying unity for the defeat of Toryism, bore fruit in helping to build up the Labour majority; but the same conditions restricted the direct Communist vote. Nevertheless, two seats were won, 102,000 votes recorded for twenty-one candidates, and a strong basis for unity established in wide areas over the country in the common campaign for the Labour majority.

The Labour Government

For the first time a Labour Government with a parliamentary majority has now been established in Britain. This is a landmark in the development of the labour movement and in political development in this country. Generations of socialists and pioneers of working-class representation have striven to achieve this aim. Marxism has always recognised this stage as an indispensable stage in the advance of the working-class movement and the political experience of the masses of the people. The two previous Labour Governments were visibly limited by the absence of a parliamentary majority. This limitation is now removed. The nation at the polls has declared its lack of confidence in the representatives of the old ruling class parties and has turned to Labour to rule the country. A new political situation opens, severe in its testing of every programme and leadership, of the strength and unity and self-discipline of the working-class movement, but rich in its possibilities and opportunities for the entire working-class movement, for democratic advance, for measures of economic and social reconstruction, and for world progress and co-operation.

A Positive Programme

The new Labour Government has been elected on the basis of a positive programme of concrete measures, embodied in "Let Us Face the Future." These measures have the united support of the entire working-class movement and of the widest sections of democratic opinion. The overcoming of the obstacles to their fulfilment will require the utmost united effort. The neglect and delays of the preceding Tory Government have left no easy inheritance. The urgent needs of the housing situation; decisions on the control and use of land and planning; the co-ordination of the necessary measures for speeding victory in the Far East with demobilisation; the switch-over from war to peace in industry, and increase in the supply of consumption goods; the maintenance and improvement of wage levels and the standards of the people; the pressing problems of coal, textiles and the other basic industries; and the fulfilment of the agreed plans on health, education and social security, all clamour for attention. Abroad, the tasks of the war against Japan; the fulfilment of the decisions of the Potsdam and San Francisco Conferences; the completion of the destruction of fascism and strengthening of democratic anti-fascist co-operation in Europe; India and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

path of liberation in the Far East; Bretton Woods and international economic co-operation, all equally press for attention. It is only necessary to survey the field to see that the situation confronting the new Labour Government is crowded with problems which will require all the understanding, the united endeavour and the co-operation of the entire labour movement and the whole nation.

Battle Against Reaction

Nor will Toryism and the great propertied and financial interests it represents, the landlords and monopolies and vested interests, the Munichites and friends of fascism, who have suffered a defeat they did not expect at the polls, take their defeat easily or abandon the struggle because the parliamentary majority is no longer in the hands of their chosen representatives. On the contrary, they will do all in their power to discredit the new Government and the new majority, to weaken its action, to exploit every difficulty in the situation, to alternate praise for every sign of weakness and threats for every sign of strength, and to use their economic, administrative and publicity power in order to sabotage effective action and spread division. Any illusions that the winning of a parliamentary majority is the end of the problems before the labour movement will soon be dispelled. Vigilance against political and economic sabotage by the big capitalists, bankers and landlords will be more than ever necessary. Attempts at fascist revival must be expected. But a firm policy, unity and strength of the movement and effective political leadership will be able to defeat these manoeuvres and carry the people forward to new victories.

Follow Up the Election Victory

We are entering no easy period of smooth progressive advance, but of harsh and formidable problems and stormy struggles. That is why the unity and co-operation of all sections of the working-class movement is so essential, and all distracting divisions in the face of the common enemy need to be overcome. The first necessity for the labour movement is to follow up the election victory by consolidating its ranks and strengthening its leadership of the people. For the first time in this election all the big towns have been won. In the coming municipal elections it will be essential to follow this up and establish local administration in the hands of Labour majorities, together with an increase of Communist representation. Trade union organisation needs now to be strengthened in the critical transition period in industry both to defend the wartime gains in the face of the already developing attacks of the employers and to co-operate with the Labour Government in the new tasks of reconstruction. Socialist propaganda needs to be extended on the widest scale to win the masses of young people, returning soldiers and all those millions of electors who have for the first time voted Labour. In all these tasks, no less than in grappling with the political and economic problems of the coming period, the Communist Party will be able to prove its worth and service in the movement, and will at the same time do all in its power to hasten the solution of the problem of working-class unity, with Communism able to play its part in a united labour movement, which is essential for the full strength of the movement and for future victory.

R. P. D.

July 29, 1945.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Election Campaign

by IVOR MONTAGU

WRITING before the declaration, it is impossible, as it is unnecessary, to attempt to forecast the result in seats. The swing to the left in sentiment among the politically articulate has been sensed as forcefully by the Conservative organisers as by those of the working-class parties.

Important features of the campaign, however, are already visible in perspective.

The keynote was set by the very first Churchill broadcast of June 4. The appearance of the Red scare, the "Labour Gestapo," the danger to savings, made it clear at once that the hopes earlier expressed of the Coalition breaking up by gentlemanly separation, and the policies becoming adjudicated by grave debate, were in the discard.

The keynote of the Labour reply was set immediately, in the radio reply next day by Mr. Attlee.

Fears that Labour would be at a disadvantage by comparison of the personalities of the two leaders were dispelled. The contrast between the ranting of the one, and the reasoned sober case presented by the other made an impression that may even have been decisive. Indeed, there is no doubt that Mr. Attlee enormously strengthened his political position in the course of the election campaign. Attlee's broadcast, his dignified and smashing answer to the two ignoble "Laski" letters from Churchill, and the contemptuous nature of the Tory attacks upon him, have together swung back to him a considerably augmented measure of respect and loyalty.

The Tory campaign could be summed up in a series of phases, each growing more hysterical with increasing nervousness, and each dropped as it became obvious that it was failing of effect.

First there was the complicated series of manoeuvres to place the blame of the rushed election on the Labour Party and present the Labour leaders as deserters from their duty in the Japanese war.

Not only was this a flop, but the identity of the hundreds of thousands disfranchised by the rush date—men and women in the services, workers displaced on essential jobs, blitz repair workers, housewives returned from evacuation—left not the slightest doubt, in the minds of the electorate, of the identity of the party that profited, and therefore was the likely culprit, in respect to the rush. It bitterly reacted against the Tory Party.

The anti-control campaign was equally a fiasco. The more controls were made an issue, the more impossible it became to conceal that it would be the profiteers and the long purse that would benefit from their removal.

The "Labour Gestapo" only evoked disgust.

The Churchill cavalcade was undoubtedly more successful at first. Toward the end, however, it became impossible to conceal from the public that the Tory press was openly lying in its pretence that the tour was a triumphal one and the indignation recoiled on the clever propagandists. In the end of the Churchill tour London crowds turned out to be the largest Labour meetings ever gathered together.

The Laski scare, chosen by Churchill for his last-minute squib, simply left the ordinary elector unmoved.

When these are listed one has retailed the sum-total of the campaigning issues chosen by the Conservative campaign strategists. Only requires to be added the strange antics in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Express newspaper, whereby, on a basis perceptibly non-existent when the texts themselves were carefully scrutinised, great headlines were made to shriek promises of lightened taxation, quicker demobilisation, lessened shortages—if only the Tories were returned.

Comparison with previous elections shows that these campaign methods were no new departure, but the inevitable result of the bankruptcy of the principal defending party of capitalism.

That word "bankruptcy" is not jargon. It really means what it says—bareness of assets.

There is no constructive policy for the modern world other than the broad socialist case. The idea of placing the national welfare first is so unassailable, so acceptable, and that once granted, the principle of organising national activity to ensure its priority so logical, that no opposite case can stand against it.

The old pretence that such organisation is impractical, an "untried theory," sounds moonshine to a generation that has seen the might of the Soviet Union and has experienced successful organisation for national welfare in war.

The real Tory objection to it—that it limits sectional privilege—is not arguable before an adult-suffrage electorate and peeps out inevitably at any attempt to argue.

Hence it is inescapable, since property will not surrender power and privilege without battle, that every Tory campaign must take the form, not of argument, but of slander and the attempt to terrorise.

The novelty of the election was not the unscrupulousness of the Tory campaign, but the maturity of the electorate, which stood up so well under an unprecedented barrage.

Judged in the light of this new maturity, the Liberal campaign made a poor show. Lord Samuel, in the first Liberal broadcast (June 6), explained that the "basic" difference between Labour and Liberalism was that while "the Labour Party had tied their fortunes to the principle that industry in general should be carried on by some form of public ownership and management. . . . Liberals held that some industries were suited for this, but that most were not."

Considering that in this election the Labour Party put forward no principle "in general" for industry, but a specific list of industries for some form of public ownership and control, Samuel's distinction appears inadequate grounds for reaching out for 400 rival candidatures.

Later in the campaign other Liberal leaders explained that they were not averse to nationalisation, but would in due course study and judge each industry's aptness separately.

One might have supposed that the least the country might have asked from a responsible party was for it to study and announce the verdicts before appealing to the electorate—before, indeed, recklessly opposing Labour, with which, on this chosen distinction, it might turn out to have no programmatic differences for the next Parliament at all!

The trouble was that, under the fatal and politically inexperienced Beveridge leadership, Liberalism set out originally to achieve a group of M.P.s, bound to neither major party, which might, with a stalemate of these two, exercise an influence out of all proportion to its numbers.

In the hour of the most significant election in Britain's history, Liberalism, which might have exercised a decisive role by itself adopting a definite policy and seeking constructive agreements whereby its centre weight could be thrown into helping return a majority that most nearly would implement that policy, became re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duced to newspaper leaders explaining that even where Liberal candidates had no chance of election, they must be voted for in hundreds to prove something or other.

No more effective device for rendering Liberal sentiment futile, for disenfranchising it, for imposing on Liberalism political hara-kiri, could be conceived.

★ ★ ★

Why were the Forces overwhelmingly for Labour—so overwhelmingly, indeed, that the imperfect arrangements for soldiers' voting were felt everywhere, in and out of the services, as a deliberate Conservative plot to reduce the effect of their opposition?

Why also did Labour canvassers feel, not only in the towns but in the country districts, a new, open surging of the civilian population towards Labour?

The Times (June 29) ungraciously admitted near the close of the campaign:—

"... the Labour Party has at least put forward plans of a sort for reorganising a group of industries which by common consent cannot revert to the state in which the war surprised them. Liberal and Conservative opponents have responded with much legitimate destructive criticism, but have so far not produced the better refutation of Socialist plans—an alternative set of plans to deal with the same difficulties."

What *The Times* so grudgingly recognised was welcomed with an avid hope by men and women longing above all for houses and for reassurance on post-war employment. They felt that in these plans for industry lay evidence of will and means to the end they wanted, and that the diversionary tactics of the Tories, the non-committal "cunning" of the Liberals, were somehow robbing them of their sovereign right to decide the issue vital to them.

Two other factors reinforced the cordiality between Labour and the electorate. One was radio. No doubt at all Labour won this battle.

Second was unity. Never has Labour approached an election in so united a spirit. It was shown in the course of the campaign that the 49 per cent. vote at Blackpool reflected an overwhelming desire on the part not only of the movement, but of the people outside the movement who were leaning toward it, for the fight to be constructive, directed against Tory obstruction and not internecine.

The leadership sensed this and responded to it. In several (not all) seats where Communists were standing and in North Hammersmith, the local Labour caucus raised an anti-Bolshevik bogy of their own (encountering what must to them have been disappointingly chill response—the voters were in militant mood and not interested in past controversies.

But it is notable that the central leadership and propaganda of the Labour Party concentrated entirely on the front in front, so to speak, for the first time abstaining from sniping sideways. The effectiveness of this strategy may surprise and enlighten them.

The Communist campaign, apart from the increase in parliamentary representation it has won, has left an indelible impression in the constituencies, uncontested as well as contested. In the former, old barriers and mental reservations will certainly have been worn thin as result of the experience of side by side working to a common end.

What after the campaign? We have expressly renounced prophecies that must be dependent on the as yet unknown, the result in seats.

But it is well to point out that, whatever this result, the shape of British, and, indeed, world politics, will be profoundly affected by the way in which the British people responded to the campaigns of this crucial election.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain and Greece*

by N. ZACHARIADES

TO achieve peace and security, a square explanation of Greek relations with Britain is necessary. The mutual distrust existing now in Greece is the principal reason for the domestic problem. Mr. Eden's statement about Greek trade union elections and the toleration of an abnormal situation by British forces in Greece, accentuate this mistrust, which is fostered by home reactionaries. British officials seem to believe that democratic Greece opposes British strategic interests in the Mediterranean and particularly in Greece. Greece belongs economically, politically and geographically to the Balkans and continental Europe. Its trade needs export to the Balkans and the Continent, wherefrom it must also buy necessary goods and materials.

But Greece belongs also to the Mediterranean region, which fact must be considered. To avoid mistrust, any interference in our domestic affairs must cease, and then the question of British interests must be discussed on an equal footing between Britain and Greece. Agreement is certain, provided it does not affect national honour and independence and integrity. To be stable, agreement must be arrived at with a democratic and not an anti-popular government. If the Dodecanese and Cyprus are incorporated with Greece, this would constitute a sound basis for a Greek-British agreement in the Mediterranean. Such an agreement, while securing British interests, would help Greece to return to democratic normality.

The Central Committee of E.A.M. defines its policy as follows. E.A.M. suggests an all-party conference to define national claims unanimously. It declares that the Dodecanese, being overwhelmingly Greek, must be united to Greece. Rectification of the northern frontier is necessary on security grounds, considering that Greece has suffered three attacks from Bulgaria within the last thirty years. Northern Epirus must be restored to Greece, but E.A.M. opposes military occupation before it is decided by the Peace Conference. Cyprus being indisputably Greek, E.A.M. trusts that Britain will satisfy the Pan-Hellenic claim for union. Concerning Eastern Thrace, E.A.M.'s parties will put the Republican-Radical party's proposal before all-party conference to decide.

Greece, having suffered terrible devastation, is entitled to demand indemnities from the three invaders. E.A.M. stresses the imperative need of elections for the Constituent Assembly as soon as possible, under the supervision of an Inter-Allied Commission guaranteeing genuine results. E.A.M. does not oppose the control of economy, but believes that as planned at present by the government, namely, without the participation of the people, it would only favour big bank capital.

Finally, E.A.M. urges union with all democratic forces and the formation of a representative government to face effectively the outstanding problems.

* From Rizospastis—5th June, 1945.

TO OUR READERS

THE EDITOR wishes to express his sincere appreciation and thanks for the friendly messages and support given him by many LABOUR MONTHLY readers during the Election Campaign.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Engels

by J. B. S. HALDANE, F.R.S.

FREDERICK ENGELS died fifty years ago. It is already clear that he was much more important for world history than most of his contemporaries who were regarded as great statesmen or great thinkers, such men as Gladstone and Disraeli; Cardinal Newman and Herbert Spencer. A few of those who were acknowledged in their own time, such as Darwin and Pasteur, have not lost in stature with the passage of time. Engels is one of the very few who have gained enormously.

This is due to a simple fact. His ideas were ahead of those of almost all his contemporaries. But they were not so far ahead that they failed to influence the course of history directly, as was the case, for example, with the socialistic ideas of the English Levellers. One might almost say that the most active period of Engels' life began twenty-two years after his death, when Lenin, as appears from *State and Revolution*, applied the theories of *The Origin of the Family* with a success whose full magnitude he did not live to see.

Engels was the friend and colleague of Marx. The history of their friendship can perhaps best be followed from their correspondence. They collaborated in the Communist Manifesto and many less important works. Marx's main writings were on economics and contemporary history. Engels applied Marxism to philosophy, the natural sciences, and anthropology as well. He always stressed that he owed his seminal ideas in these fields to Marx, but he certainly developed them very greatly. And if Marx had not lived it is clear that Engels would have been a great intellectual leader of socialism, though we cannot say at how many of Marx's ideas he would have arrived.

Engels was a man of astonishing energy and versatility. He earned his living—and incidentally he gave Marx much financial help—as a cotton broker in Manchester. He was secretary of the First International. Apart from politics and economics, he wrote on physics, chemistry, biology, anthropology, philosophy, and war. He was a fox hunter because he hoped to be a cavalry leader in the revolution, as he had been in 1848 in Germany. Unlike Marx, who was highly monogamous, he had a series of love affairs.

A college of specialists would be needed to appreciate all the activities of such a man. I can only write with any authority on his contributions to science. *The Origin of the Family*, based on a comparatively small body of anthropological data, requires some correction as the result of new knowledge, but substantially less so than, for example, the accounts of animal evolution given by his contemporaries, Huxley and Haeckel. It still provides a framework into which later studies can be fitted without much difficulty. The modern Soviet school of prehistory demonstrates the fruitfulness of his approach.

Since he wrote *Anti-Duhring*, *Feuerbach* and *Dialectics of Nature* physics and chemistry have been revolutionised, substantially along the lines which he predicted. He contended that the Daltonian elements were probably compounds and certainly not indestructible. He could not be expected to have foreseen nuclear physics. Writing of electrochemistry as the point of contact of chemistry and physics he wrote "it is precisely at this point that the biggest results are to be expected." The results have occurred. We cannot therefore go to Engels for a detailed discussion of modern physical problems, but we can and should see how

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he tackled the problems of his day. His method remains perfectly valid, and should help us to see where "the biggest results are to be expected."

In the field of biology the changes since Engels' time have not been so great, and many of his detailed points are still very well worth making, for example, the fact that natural selection is not necessarily associated with over-population, though it may be, and the fact that in human evolution the hand developed before the organs of speech.

It was not an accident that Engels saw so far into the problems of science. With Marx's help, he had attained to a deeper insight into the general laws of change than anyone before him. He was thus able to see facts both about changes in nature, and changes in human ways of controlling and understanding nature, which escaped his contemporaries.

Fifty years after his death his works are still a guide to scientific and political method. Provided they are used as a source of methods and not of dogmas, we cannot study them too carefully.

Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Communist Party

(Founded 31st July—1st August, 1920)

by R. PAGE ARNOT

IN the summer of victory in Europe, the Communist Party completes its twenty-fifth year. The liberated peoples are beginning their new life, awakening to their new democracy amidst the wrecks of a dissolving nightmare. Whatever difficulties lie ahead, this year makes a fit setting for the British Communist Party's silver jubilee, and must inspire not only its members but the masses of the people with confidence to overcome all obstacles to the final triumph of democracy and socialism.

The role of the Communist Party is part of the development of the British working-class movement. The whole labour movement has passed through its most critical period in these twenty-five years; and, if now the prospect is fair, it is due both to the part the working-class has played within the nation's struggle and to the part played by the Communist Party within the working-class movement.

The war of 1914-1918 had shattered all the old illusions of peaceful progress within capitalism, undisturbed by wars or reactionary violence. The last war confronted the working-class movement with entirely new surroundings with which its previous history had left it ill-equipped to deal. The advance in the numbers of the organised workers and the changed relation of class forces which marked the revolutionary advance of 1917 to 1920 in Britain as in other countries, had brought great opportunities to the labour movement.

It was that section of the workers that recognised the changed character of the new epoch, which saw most clearly both the opportunities and the dangers and the need for a strengthening of the working-class struggle which took on themselves the pioneers' task and formed the Communist Party.

They saw the need of new methods to suit new times, the need of building up a real unity of the working-class movement against the powers of modern monopoly capitalism. They saw the weakness of the old structure, of sectional trade unions without uni-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fying conception or organised centre, of a co-operative movement then at its farthest from the outlook of the founders of Co-operation and more than at any other time under the sway of "Big Business" conceptions, of a Labour Party which had failed to muster the forces of the working-class in a determined struggle against imperialism, following leaders who had early succumbed to capitalist influences. The Communists sought to revive the best traditions of the working-class movement when these were in danger of being forgotten or extinguished, and they sought to imbue the mass of the workers with a confidence in their own strength and to equip them with advanced theoretical conceptions by which to find and follow the true course unflinchingly.

All this concern for the unity, strengthening and true direction of the working-class movement had to be expressed by what was then a small grouping, hampered by poverty of resources and lack of experience, amid unprecedented mass unemployment and industrial strikes. It had to be expressed not in words only but in action, in the day to day struggles as well as in the gigantic conflicts into which the labour movement was plunged.

The pioneers' task is never an easy one. Not only can it meet with misunderstanding and opposition from those who do not see the risk of staying in the old rut, but it encountered the utmost hatred from those who wanted to pull in a different direction and whose strategy of retreat after retreat ended finally in surrender.

For nearly half its existence the tendency represented by Ramsay MacDonald was dominant in the leadership of the labour movement. Therefore it is not surprising that Macdonald, Snowden and others carried on a bitter struggle against the Communist Party. The Labour Party, a federal body made up of affiliated trade unions and socialist organisations, included the British Socialist Party, which was the main constituent of the Communist Party at its formation in 1920. Not only was the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party rejected but, by a series of decisions culminating in the 1924 Conference presided over by Ramsay Macdonald, and the Liverpool Conference of 1925, Communists were laid under a ban. Under the same malign influence of Macdonaldism some trade unions were induced to forego their all-in democratic principle and to expel Communists or deprive them of their rights and so render them "second class citizens" within the union. The Macdonald tendency was not finally exposed until 1931, when he wrecked the Labour Government of which he was Prime Minister and crossed to become Prime Minister of the Tories—until he and Lord Snowden abandoned the Party they had misled for so long to become the darlings of the rich and the political concubines of Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain.

Warning had been given in 1920. Lenin had used a searing phrase:—

"Ramsay MacDonald's article is the best example that could be given of that smooth, melodious, banal, and socialist-seeming phraseology which serves in all developed capitalist countries to camouflage the policy of the bourgeoisie inside the labour movement."

The warning and the current fight of the Communist Party against MacDonaldism went largely unheeded. Twenty-one years after Lenin, Bernard Shaw told with what dismay he and Sidney Webb looked upon the outcome of the MacDonald tendency in the Labour Party they had helped to form. The poison of MacDonaldism only slowly worked itself out of the system. Traces are still found in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Party at the present day. But the need for the fight against fascism began to be brought home to the whole movement and the lead given by the Communists in the vanguard of that fight began, however tardily, to be followed.

The MacDonald tendency, only revealed in its sinister proportion in the first half of the period between the wars, was actually a carry-over of a monstrous development from an earlier stage of the labour movement. It was the inheritor of the old Liberal tradition, as the Communist Party was the inheritor of the Chartist and socialist tradition. Our Chartist forefathers, who formed the first working man's political party in the world, had not been able to see victory, though their concrete proposals gradually bore fruit one after another. It was in the 'seventies that the liberal tendency got a powerful hold on the leaders of the trade unions and, under cover of the phrase "political neutrality," upon the leaders of the co-operative societies. The 'eighties brought the revival of socialist ideas against the bitter opposition of trade union leaders who had become Liberal partisans; and these socialist ideas found expression in the formation in 1900 of the Labour Party which is one great British working-class landmark. But the battle was not over. The Liberal influence continued to operate—but now within the Labour Party. The fundamental liberalism of MacDonald and Snowden, who had put on socialism as a garment, clogged the development of the Labour Party. As an expression of the working-class movement the Labour Party in those years before 1914 was unable to face the terrific tasks of struggle in an imperialist world.

It was as a resumption of the fight of the '80's under new conditions—symbolised by the presence within the leadership of the Communist Party of Tom Mann, who had led the Dockers' Strike of 1889—that the Communist Party came together.

It was to play its part within the organs of the labour movement, strengthening and revivifying them until the present time, when the need for unity is being recognised in one of the big unions after another, and when the victory over fascism cannot fail to react with unifying and purifying effect on the inner democracy of the working-class movement.

The formation of the Communist Party as an integral and integrating part of the whole labour movement will ever be regarded as another landmark in the history of the British working-class.

The move to the left, gathering pace in these last years and clearly visible in the election campaign, is bound to express itself in the new parliament. In that new period ahead the Communist Party, long since grown to maturity, will play a true and essential part.

NOTE TO READERS

There was an exceptionally heavy demand for the July LABOUR MONTHLY. As the ordinary demand far exceeds the possible supply owing to the restrictions made by the Paper Control, this additional demand may have caused many of our regular readers to have missed their copies. Any readers in this position can avoid this in future by taking out a postal subscription for the LABOUR MONTHLY. Rates :—

Home : 7s. for twelve months; 3s. 6d. for six months.

Abroad: 8s. for twelve months; 4s. for six months.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Dissolution of the Communist Party of the U.S.

(For the interest of our readers we publish this article, by JACQUES DUCLOS, *reprinted from the April issue of* Cahiers du Communisme, *theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France. The article is given complete, with the exception of short introductory remarks directed to French readers and of two minor passages indicated in the text.*—Ed. L.M.)

THE reason for dissolution of the Communist Party in the U.S.A. and for the "new course" in the activity of American Communists are set forth in official documents of the Party and in a certain number of speeches of its former secretary, Earl Browder. In his speech devoted to the results of the Teheran Conference and the political situation in the United States, delivered December 12, 1943, in Bridgeport and published in the *Communist* magazine in January, 1944, Earl Browder for the first time discussed the necessity of changing the course of the C.P.U.S.A.

The Teheran Conference served as Browder's point of departure from which to develop his conceptions favourable to a change of course of the American C.P. However, while justly stressing the importance of the Teheran Conference for victory in the war against fascist Germany, Earl Browder drew from the Conference decisions erroneous conclusions in no wise flowing from a Marxist analysis of the situation. Earl Browder made himself the protagonist of a false concept of the ways of social evolution in general, and in the first place, the social evolution of the U.S. Earl Browder declared, in effect, that at Teheran capitalism and socialism had begun to find the means of peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the framework of one and the same world; he added that the Teheran accords regarding common policy similarly presupposed common efforts with a view to reducing to a minimum or completely suppressing methods of struggle and opposition of force to force in the solution of internal problems of each country.

That (the Teheran Declaration) is the only hope of a continuance of civilisation in our time. That is why I can accept and support and believe in the Declaration at Teheran and make it the starting point for all my thinking about the problems of our country and the world. (Address at Bridgeport, Conn., December 12, 1943.)

Starting from the decisions of the Teheran Conference, Earl Browder drew political conclusions regarding the problems of the world, and above all the internal situation in the United States. Some of these conclusions claim that the principal problems of internal political problems of the United States must in the future be solved exclusively by means of reforms for the "expectation of unlimited inner conflict threatens also the perspective of international unity held forth at Teheran." (*Teheran and America*, pages 16-17.)

The Teheran agreements mean to Earl Browder that the greatest part of Europe, west of the Soviet Union, will probably be reconstituted on a bourgeois democratic basis and not on a fascist-capitalist or Soviet basis.

But it will be a capitalist basis which is conditioned by the principle of complete democratic self-determination for each nation, allowing full expression within each nation of all progressive and constructive forces and setting up no obstacles to the development of democracy and social progress in accordance with the varying desires of the peoples. It means a perspective for Europe minimising, and to a great extent eliminating altogether, the threat of civil war after the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

international war. (Bridgeport speech, *Communist*, January, 1944, page 7.)

And Earl Browder adds:

Whatever may be the situation in other lands, in the United States this means a perspective in the immediate post-war period, of expanded production and employment and the strengthening of democracy within the framework of the present system—and not a perspective of the transition to socialism.

We can set our goal as the realisation of the Teheran policy, or we can set ourselves the task of pushing the United States immediately into socialism. Clearly, however, we cannot choose both.

The first policy, with all its difficulties, is definitely within the realm of possible achievement. The second would be dubious, indeed, especially when we remember that even the most progressive section of the labour movement is committed to capitalism, is not even as vaguely socialistic as the British Labour Party.

Therefore, the policy for Marxists in the United States is to face with all its consequences the perspective of a capitalist post-war reconstruction in the United States, to evaluate all plans on that basis, and to collaborate actively with the most democratic and progressive majority in the country, in a national unity sufficiently broad and effective to realise the policies of Teheran. (*Teheran and America*, page 20.)

To put the Teheran policy into practice, Earl Browder considers that it is necessary to reconstruct the entire political and social life of the U.S.

Every class, every group, every individual, every political party in America will have to readjust itself to this great issue embodied in the policy given to us by Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill. The country is only beginning to face it so far. Everyone must begin to draw the conclusion from it and adjust himself to the new world that is created by it. Old formulas and old prejudices are going to be of no use whatever to us as guides to find our way in this new world. We are going to have to draw together all men and all groups with the intelligence enough to see the overwhelming importance of this issue, to understand that upon its correct solution depends the fate of our country and the fate of civilisation throughout the world.

We shall have to be prepared to break with anyone that refuses to support and fight for the realisation of the Teheran Agreement and the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition. We must be prepared to give the hand of co-operation and fellowship to everyone who fights for the realisation of this coalition. If J. P. Morgan supports this coalition and goes down the line for it, I as a Communist am prepared to clasp his hand on that and join with him to realise it. Class divisions or political groupings have no significance now except as they reflect one side or the other of this issue. (Bridgeport speech, January, 1944, *Communist*, page 8.)

Browder's remark regarding Morgan provoked quite violent objections from members of the American C.P. Explaining this idea to the plenary session of the central committee, Browder said that:—

I was not making a verbal abolition of class differences, but that I was rejecting the political slogan of "class against class" as our guide to political alignments in the next period. I spoke of Mr. Morgan symbolically as the representative of a class, and not as an individual—in which capacity I know him not at all. (*Teheran and America*, page 24.)

As Browder indicates, creation of a vast national unity in the U.S. presupposes that the Communists would be a part of this. Thus, the Communist organisation must conclude a long-term alliance with far more important forces. From these considerations, Browder drew the conclusion that the Communist organisation in the U.S. should change its name, reject the word "party" and take another name more exactly reflecting its role, a name more in conformity, according to him, with the political traditions of America.

Earl Browder proposed to name the new organisation "Communist Political Association," which, in the traditional American two-party system will not intervene as a "party," that is, it will not propose candidates

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the elections, will neither enter the Democratic nor Republican Party, but will work to assemble a broad progressive and democratic movement within all parties.

In his report to the plenary session of the central committee of the C.P.U.S.A., Browder spoke in detail of the economic problems of U.S. post-war national economy, and their solution on the basis of collaboration and unity of different classes. Browder indicated that American business men, industrialists, financiers and even reactionary organisations do not admit the possibility of a new economic crisis in the U.S. after the war. On the contrary, all think that U.S. national economy after the war can preserve and maintain the same level of production as during the war.

However, the problem is in the difficulties of transition from wartime economic activity to peacetime production, and in the absorption by home and foreign markets of $90 billions in supplementary merchandise which the American government is now buying for war needs. In this regard, Earl Browder claims that the Teheran Conference decisions make possible the overcoming of Anglo-American rivalry in the struggle for foreign outlets, and that the government of the United States, in agreement with its great Allies, and with the participation of governments of interested states, can create a series of giant economic associations for development of backward regions and war-devastated regions in Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The Slogan of "Free Enterprise"

As to extension of the home market, to permit absorption of a part of the $90,000,000,000 worth of merchandise, Browder suggests doubling the purchasing power of the average consumer, notably by wage increases.

Marxists will not help the reactionaries by opposing the slogan of "Free Enterprise" with any form of counter-slogan. If anyone wishes to describe the existing system of capitalism in the United States as "free enterprise," that is all right with us, and we frankly declare that we are ready to co-operate in making this capitalism work effectively in the post-war period with the least possible burdens upon the people. (*Teheran and America*, page 21.)

Further, Browder claims that national unity could no more be obtained by following a policy based on slogans aimed at the monopolies and big capital.

Today, to speak seriously of drastic curbs on monopoly capital, leading toward the breaking of its power, and imposed upon monopoly capital against its will, is merely another form of proposing the immediate transition to socialism. . . . (*Teheran and America*, page 23.)

In his closing speech to the plenary session of the C.P. central committee in January, 1944, Browder tried to base himself on "theoretical" arguments to justify the change of course of the American C.P. Also he expressed his concept of Marxism and its application under present conditions.

Browder thinks that by pronouncing the dissolution of the C.P. and creating the C.P.A., the American Communists are following the correct path, resolving problems which have no parallel in history and demonstrating how Marxist theory should be applied in practice.

Marxism never was a series of dogmas and formulas; it never was a catalogue of prohibitions listing the things we must not do irrespective of new developments and new situations; it does not tell us that things cannot be done; it tells us how to do the things that have to be done, the things that history has posed as necessary and indispensable tasks. Marxism is a theory of deeds, not of don'ts. Marxism is therefore a positive, dynamic, creative force, and it is such a great social power precisely because, as a scientific outlook and method, it takes living realities as its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

starting point. It has always regarded the scientific knowledge of the past as a basis for meeting the new and unprecedented problems of the present and the future. And the largest problems today are new in a very basic sense.

We have more than ever the task to refresh ourselves in the great tradition of Marxism, completely freeing ourselves from the last remnants of the dogmatic and schematic approach. . . .

True, according to all of the text books of the past, we are departing from orthodoxy, because none of our text books foresaw or predicted a long period of peaceful relations in the world before the general advent of socialism. (*Teheran and America*, pages 43-45.)

The criticism by William Z. Foster

The new political course outlined by Browder found but few adversaries among the leading militants of the C.P.U.S.A. William Foster, president of the C.P.U.S.A. expounded his differences with Browder in two documents—in a letter to the national committee of the C.P.U.S.A. and in his introductory speech to the extraordinary session of the national committee on February 8, 1944.

In these two documents, Foster criticises Browder's theoretical theses regarding the change in the character of monopoly capital in the U.S.A., the perspectives of post-war economic development, as well as Browder's position on the question of the Presidential elections. In his February 8 speech Foster also attacks those who, on the basis of Browder's theses, suggested that strikes be renounced in the post war period. But in neither one of these documents did Foster openly take a stand against the dissolution of the Communist Party.

In his report Comrade Browder, in attempting to apply the Teheran decisions to the United States, drew a perspective of a smoothly working national unity, including the decisive sections of American finance capital, not only during the war but also in the post-war: a unity which (with him quoting approvingly from *Victory and After*) would lead to "a rapid healing of the terrible wounds of the war" and would extend on indefinitely, in an all-class peaceful collaboration, for a "long term of years." In this picture, American imperialism virtually disappears, there remains hardly a trace of the class struggle, and Socialism plays practically no role whatever. (Foster Letter to Members of N.C.)

Foster violently criticised Browder because the latter while outlining a new course in the activity of the American C.P., had lost sight of several of the most fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism.

It seems to me that Comrade Browder's rather rosy outlook for capitalism is based upon two errors. The first of these is an underestimation of the deepening of the crisis of world capitalism caused by the war. When questioned directly in Political Bureau discussion, Comrade Browder agreed that capitalism has been seriously weakened by the war, but his report would tend to give the opposite implication. The impression is left that capitalism has somehow been rejuvenated and is now entering into a new period of expansion and growth. (Ibid.)

According to Foster, world capitalism can surely count on a certain post-war boom, but it would be wrong to think that capitalism, even American capitalism, could maintain itself at the production level attained in wartime, and resolve, in a measure more or less satisfactory to the working-class, the complex problems which will arise after the war.

Without diminishing the importance of the Teheran conference, Foster considered, nevertheless, that it would be an extremely dangerous illusion to think that Teheran had in any way changed the class nature of capitalism, that the Teheran conference had liquidated the class struggle, as it appears from Browder's speech. The fact that capitalism has learned to live in peace and in alliance with socialism is far from meaning that American monopoly capitalism has become pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gressive and that it can henceforth be unreservedly included in national unity in the struggle for the realisation of the Teheran conference decisions.

The class nature of imperialistic capitalism is reactionary. That is why national unity with it is impossible. The furious attack of these circles against the democratic Roosevelt government—does this not supply a convincing proof? Can one doubt, after that, that the monopolist sections in the U.S. are enemies and not friends of the Teheran decisions as Earl Browder thinks?

The danger in this whole point of view is that, in our eagerness to secure support for Teheran, we may walk into the trap of trying to co-operate with the enemies of Teheran, or even of falling under their influence. Trailing after the big bourgeoisie is the historic error of social-democracy, and we must be vigilantly on guard against it. (Foster Letter to Members of N.C.)

Foster also criticised Browder for his attitude toward the National Association of Manufacturers, which is, in his opinion, one of the most reactionary organisations of monopoly capital in the U.S. However, Browder thought he had to approve a certain number of the economic measures of this association. He accepts its central slogan, that of "free private enterprise," which is in reality basically reactionary and contrary to the Roosevelt policy. What is more, Browder, counting on seeing workers' wages increased 100 per cent. after the war, invites U.S. monopolists to share his good intentions and says to them: "(You) must find the solution in order to keep their plants in operation."

Citing these words of Browder's, Foster declared:—

In my opinion, it would be a catastrophe for the labour movement if it accepted such a plan or such an idea, even if only provisionally. Starting from a notoriously erroneous conception, that U.S. monopoly capitalism can play a progressive role, Comrade Browder looks askance at all suggestions tending to subdue the monopolies, whereas C.P. can accept only one policy, that of tending to master these big capitalists now and after the war. In calling for the collaboration of classes, Browder sows wrong illusions of tailism in the minds of trade union members. Whereas the job of the trade unions is to elaborate their policy and dictate it to the big employers.

As to the problems of post-war organisation, Foster repudiated all illusions regarding the self-styled progressive role of monopoly capital. America, Foster declared, will emerge from the war as a powerful state in the world, the industrial magnates will be rather inclined to dictatorial acts than to compromises, and it is hardly likely, he added, that we can expect a progressive programme from them.

So far as the bulk of finance capital is concerned, starting out with a pre-war record of appeasement, it has, all through the war, followed a course of rank profiteering and often outright sabotage of both the domestic and foreign phases of the nation's war programme, especially the former. While these elements obviously do not want the United States to lose the war, they are certainly very poor defenders of the policy of unconditional surrender. In the main, their idea of a satisfactory outcome of the war would be some sort of a negotiated peace with German reactionary forces, and generally to achieve a situation that would put a wet blanket on all democratic governments in Europe. (Foster Letter to Members of the N.C.)

Foster thinks that Browder is right when he says that the question of socialism is not the issue of the present war and that to pose this question would only result in restricting the framework of national unity. But considering the fact that the successes of the U.S.S.R. will increase the interest of the masses in socialism, the Communists must explain to the workers the importance of the socialist development of our epoch and the way in which it concerns the U.S., for otherwise the Social Democrats could represent themselves as a part of socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The enforcement of the Teheran decisions, both in their national and international aspects, demands the broadest possible national unity, and in this national unity there must be workers, farmers, professionals, small businessmen and all of the capitalist elements who will loyally support the programme. (Foster Letter to Members of the N.C.)

Foster's letter to the National Committee and his speech at the extraordinary session of the National Committee on February 8, 1944, against Browder's line, provoked violent criticism from those in attendance. Most speakers rejected Foster's arguments and supported the "new course" of the C.P. of the United States outlined by Browder. . . .

After the extraordinary session of the National Committee, a discussion on Browder's report to the plenary assembly of the Central Committee was opened in the basic organisations of the Party, in regional congresses and the Party press.

According to information published in the *Daily Worker*, after the discussion the organisations and regional congresses of the Party unanimously accepted Browder's proposals. As to Foster, he declared at the extraordinary session of the National Committee that he did not intend to make known his difference with Browder outside the Party Central Committee.

The Communist Political Association of the United States

The Congress of the C.P.U.S.A. (held May 20, 1944) heard Browder's report, in which he expressed his opinions regarding the political situation in the U.S. and he proposed adoption of a new course in the policy of Communists of the U.S. Proposing a resolution on the dissolution of the C.P.U.S.A., Browder declared:—

On January 11 the National Committee of the Communist Party in the interest of national unity and to enable the Communists to function most effectively in the changed political conditions and to make still greater contributions towards winning the war and securing a durable peace, recommended that the American Communists should renounce the aim of partisan advantage and the party form of organisation. . . .

With that purpose, I propose in the name of the National Committee and in consultation with the most important delegations in this Convention, the adoption of the following motion:—

I hereby move that the Communist Party of America be and hereby is dissolved. . . . (*Proceedings*, page 11.)

After having accepted the resolution on dissolution of the C.P., the congress of the C.P.U.S.A. proclaimed itself the constituent congress of the Communist Political Association of the United States and adopted a programmatic introduction to the Association's statutes. In this introduction it is said:—

The Communist Political Association is a non-party organisation of Americans which, basing itself upon the working-class, carries forward the traditions of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, under the changed conditions of modern industrial society.

It seeks effective application of democratic principles to the solution of the problems of today, as an advanced sector of the democratic majority of the American people.

It upholds the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the achievements of American democracy against all the enemies of popular liberties.

It is shaped by the needs of the nation at war, being formed in the midst of the greatest struggle of all history; it recognises that victory for the free peoples over fascism will open up new and more favourable conditions for progress; it looks to the family of free nations, led by the great coalition of democratic capitalist and socialist states, to inaugurate an era of world peace, expanding production and economic well-being, and the liberation and equality of all peoples regardless of race, creed or colour.

It adheres to the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism, the heritage of the best thought of humanity and of a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred years' experience of the labour movement, principles which have proved to be indispensable to the national existence and independence of every nation: it looks forward to a future in which, by democratic choice of the American people, our own country will solve the problems arising out of the contradiction between the social character of production and its private ownership, incorporating the lessons of the most fruitful achievements of all mankind in a form and manner consistent with American traditions and character. . . . .

(Preamble, *Proceedings*, pages 47-48.)

The Constituent Congress of the C.P.A. adopted a main political resolution, "National Unity for Victory, Security and a Durable Peace."

The resolution points out the exceptional importance of the Teheran conference decisions for victory over the aggressor and establishment of a lasting peace. It calls for reinforcement of national unity as the necessary conditions for the application of those historic decisions.

By national unity is meant union of all patriotic forces from Communists, Labourites to adherents of the Democratic and Republican parties. All ideological, religious and political differences must be subordinated to this unity. The resolution stresses the exceptional importance of the 1944 elections on whose results depend the country's unity and destiny. It recognises the increasingly important role of the working-class in national unity, its growing activity and its political influence.

The resolution flays the reactionary policy of groups led by DuPont Hearst, McCormick, characterising this policy as pro-fascist and treason, and calling on the American people to struggle against these groups.

The resolution then says that the majority of the American people is not yet convinced of the need for a more radical solution to social and economic problems with the aid of nationalisation of big industry or by means of establishing socialism.

That is why the immediate task consists in obtaining a higher level of production in the framework of the existing capitalist regime. With this, private employers must receive all possibilities to solve the problem of production and employment of labour. Solution of these problems is likewise, in the first place, linked to the maximum increase in the American people's purchasing power and extension of foreign commerce. If private industry cannot solve these tasks, the government must assume responsibility for their realisation.

The resolution expresses itself against anti-Semitism, anti-Negro discrimination, calls for the outlawing of the "fifth column" and for the banning of calls by the latter for a negotiated peace with the aggressor.

The resolution concludes in these terms:—

For the camp of national unity, which is composed of the patriotic forces of all classes, from the working people to the capitalists, rests and depends upon the working-class, the backbone and driving force of the nation and its win-the-war coalition. . . . It requires the extension of labour's united action of the A.F.L., the C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods. It requires the most resolute development of labour's political initiative and influence, with labour's full and adequate participation in the government.

. . . we Communists, as patriotic Americans, renew our sacred pledge to the nation to subordinate everything to win the war and to destroy fascism. . . . (*Resolutions*, page 7.)

In addition to the resolution on "National unity," the C.P.A. Congress passed a series of other decisions: on transition from war to peace-time production; on international trade union unity; on the C.P.A.'s wage policy; on political life as it regards demobilised veterans; on work among women; on farmers; on the situation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the southern states; on suppressing the poll tax; on the fight against anti-Semitism; on unity among countries of the western hemisphere and on the 25th anniversary of the Communist movement in the U.S.

The congress unanimously elected Browder president of the C.P.A. The C.P.A. Congress addressed a message (*text of this in full in the original*) to Comrade Stalin and the Red Army.

Election Policy of the Communist Political Association

After the constituent congress, the leadership of the C.P.A. waged a campaign of explanation on the aims and tasks of the Association.

In one of his speeches Browder said:—

. . . That is why we dissolved the Communist Party, renounced all aims of partisan advancement, and regrouped ourselves into the nonpartisan Communist Political Association. That is why we are ready and willing to work with any and all Americans who place victory in the war as the first law, and who move toward such a minimum programme as we have outlined for the solution of our post-war problems. This is why we do not associate ourselves with any other political party, but rather with the most forward-looking men in all parties. (*The War and the Elections, D.W., June* 18, 1944.)

Explaining the functions of the C.P.A., its organisational secretary, Williamson, declared:—

As regards the functioning of the Association, we emphasise that this means manifold increase and improvement in every aspect of political-educational activity, on a national, state and local club basis. We must become known as an organisation whose grasp of Marxism provides us with correct answers to the complex political problems confronting the people. While the members belong to, and are active in every type of mass organisation—political, economic, cultural, fraternal, etc.—the Association in its own name will speak out boldly and with initiative on all issues and policies." (Williamson, *Proceedings*, pages 55-56.)

The practical activity of the C.P.A. since the congress was subordinated to the principal task of the hour: active participation of the C.P.A. in the 1944 election campaign.

The national C.P.A. congress unanimously backed Mr. Roosevelt's Presidential candidacy. In their speeches, Browder and the other leaders of the C.P.A. in the name of the C.P.A. supported Mr. Roosevelt's election to a fourth term. The regional-state organisations of the C.P.A. and local clubs carried on an active propaganda campaign in favour of Mr. Roosevelt and congressional candidates favourable to Mr. Roosevelt

On September 25, 1944, during a meeting called by the New York C.P.A. on the 25th anniversary of the Communist movement in the U.S., Browder gave a speech in which he declared:—

. . . every group, however small, just as every individual has the same supreme duty to make its complete and unconditional contribution to victory. We must give not only our lives, but we must be ready also to sacrifice our prejudices, our ideologies, and our special interests. We American Communists have applied this rule first of all to ourselves.

We know that Hitler and the Mikado calculated to split the United Nations on the issue of Communism and anti-Communism; we know that the enemy calculated to split America on this issue in the current elections, and thus prepare our country for withdrawal from the war and a compromise peace. We therefore set ourselves, as our special supreme task, to remove the Communists and Communism from this election campaign as in any way an issue, directly or indirectly.

To this end we unhesitatingly sacrificed our electoral rights in this campaign, by refraining from putting forward our own candidates; we went to the length of dissolving the Communist Party itself for an indefinite period in the future; we declared our readiness to loyally support the existing system of private enterprise which is accepted by the overwhelming majority of Americans, and to raise no proposals for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any fundamental changes which could in any way endanger the national unity; we went out into the trade unions and the masses of the people, straightforwardly and frankly using all our influence to firmly establish this policy of national unity; we helped with all our strength to restrain all impulses toward strike movements among the workers, and to prepare the workers for a continuation of national unity after the war. . . .

As spokesman for American Communists I can say for our small group that we completely identify ourselves with our nation, its interests, and the majority of its people, in this support for Roosevelt and Truman for President and Vice-President.

We know quite well that the America that Roosevelt leads is a capitalist America, and that it is the mission of Roosevelt, among other things, to keep it so. We know that only great disasters for our country could change this perspective of our country from that of capitalism to that of socialism, in the foreseeable future. Only failure to carry through the war to victory, or a botching of the peace and failure to organise it, or the plunging of our country into another economic catastrophe like that of the Hoover era, could turn the American people to socialism.

We do not want disaster for America, even though it results in socialism. If we did, we would support Dewey and Hoover and Bricker and their company. We want victory in the war, with the Axis powers and all their friends eliminated from the world. We want a world organised for generations of peace.

We want our country's economy fully at work, supplying a greatly multiplied world market to heal the wounds of the world, a greatly expanded home market reflecting rising standards of living here, and an orderly, co-operative and democratic working out of our domestic and class relationships, within a continuing national unity that will reduce and eventually eliminate large domestic struggles. . . .

That is why American Communists, even as our great Communist forbears in 1860 and 1864 supported Abraham Lincoln, will in 1944 support Franklin Delano Roosevelt for President of the United States. . . .

As to Browder's attitude toward the Soviet Union, he highly appreciates the U.S.S.R.'s role in the United Nations system and in the work of finally crushing Hitlerite Germany and establishing a lasting peace after the war. Browder stressed more than once that the Soviet state built by Lenin and Stalin constitutes the irreplaceable force which saved the world from fascist slavery and he called for it to be made known to all Americans all the wisdom of Leninist-Stalinist theory that made the Soviet Union great and powerful.

Organisational structure

From an organisational point of view, the C.P.A. structure is as follows: the basic organisational cell is the territorial club whose general meeting is called once a month. Between general membership meetings all the work planned by the club is carried out by its committee, made up of the most active members. The clubs are subordinated to regional C.P.A. councils. The leading organisation of the C.P.A. is the National Committee elected for two years at the Association congress. The Association's president and 11 vice-presidents elected by the congress comprise the permanent leading organisation of the Association. The C.P.A. congress set forth maintenance of the principle of democratic centralism as the structural basis of the Association. Williamson, C.P.A. organisational secretary, explained to the congress in these terms the application of the democratic centralism principle of the C.P.A.:—

> . . . While maintaining a structure and minimum organisational requirements compatible with the character of a Marxist political educational association, we must grant greater autonomy to the lower organisations, emphasise that democracy is a two-way street from top to bottom and bottom to top, and eliminate all rigidity of organisation. (Williamson, *Proceedings*, p. 58.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The national congress of the Political Association adopted the C.P.A. constitution in which it said that everyone who wishes to belong to the C.P.A. accepts its programme and its line. Explaining who can belong to the Association, the *Daily Worker* wrote:—

We can ask of new applicants to membership in the Party only loyalty to the principles that are already comprehensive to all workers, devotion to the most basic duties of action today; plus a willingness and eagerness to study the programme and history and the theory which will make them thorough Communists. And above all a willingness to fight, to sacrifice in the war of mankind against Nazi enslavement is the first requirement for entering the Communist Party. (Minor, D.W., February, 1944.)

At the time of its dissolution the Communist Party of the United States, according to Browder's declaration, had 80,000 members without counting the 10,000 Party members in the army. According to the Congress decisions, all members of the C.P.U.S.A. are members of the C.P.A. and must register before July 4, 1944. As the *Daily Worker* announced, up to July 16, 1944, hardly 45,000 persons had gotten themselves registered.

Criticism of Browder's Policy

Without analysing in detail Browder's full position on the dissolution of the C.P.U.S.A. and creation of the Communist Political Association, and without making a developed critique of this position, one can nevertheless deduce from it the following conclusions:—

1. The course applied under Browder's leadership ended in practice in liquidation of the independent political party of the working-class in the U.S.

2. Despite declarations regarding recognition of the principles of Marxism, one is witnessing a notorious revision of Marxism on the part of Browder and his supporters, a revision which is expressed in the concept of a long-term class peace in the United States, of the possibility of the suppression of the class struggle in the post-war period and of establishment of harmony between labour and capital.

3. By transforming the Teheran declaration of the Allied governments, which is a document of a diplomatic character, into a political platform of class peace in the United States in the post-war period, the American Communists are deforming in a radical way the meaning of the Teheran declaration and are sowing dangerous opportunist illusions which will exercise a negative influence on the American labour movement if they are not met with the necessary reply.

4. According to what is known up to now, the Communist Parties of most countries have not approved Browder's position and several Communist Parties (for example, that of the Union of South Africa and that of Australia) have come out openly against this position, while the Communist Parties of several South American countries (Cuba, Colombia) regarded the position of the American Communists as correct and in general followed the same path.

Such are the facts. Such are the elements of understanding which permit passing judgment on the dissolution of the American Communist Party. French Communists will not fail to examine in the light of Marxist-Leninist critique the arguments developed to justify the dissolution of the American Communist Party. One can be sure that, like the Communists of the Union of South Africa and of Australia, the French Communists will not approve the policy followed by Browder for it has swerved dangerously from the victorious Marxist-Leninist doctrine whose rigorously scientific application could lead to but

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one conclusion, not to dissolve the American Communist Party but to work to strengthen it under the banner of stubborn struggle to defeat Hitler Germany and destroy everywhere the extensions of fascism.

The fact that all the members of the Communist Party of the United States did not sign up automatically in the Communist Political Association shows that the dissolution of the Party provoked anxieties, perfectly legitimate besides.

In the United States the omnipotent trusts have been the object of violent criticism. It is known, for instance, that the former Vice-President of the United States, Henry Wallace, has denounced their evil doings and their anti-national policy.

We, too, in France, are resolute partisans of national unity, and we show that in our daily activity, but our anxiety for unity does not make us lose sight for a single moment of the necessity of arraying ourselves against the men of the trusts.

Furthermore, one can observe a certain confusion in Browder's declarations regarding the problem of nationalisation of monopolies and what he calls the transition from capitalism to socialism. Nationalisation of monopolies actually in no sense constitutes a socialist achievement, contrary to what certain people would be inclined to believe. No, in nationalisation it is simply a matter of reforms of a democratic character, achievement of socialism being impossible to imagine without preliminary conquest of power.

Everyone understands that the Communists of the United States want to work to achieve unity in their country. But it is less understandable that they envisage the solution of the problem of national unity with the good will of the men of the trusts, and under quasi-idyllic conditions as if the capitalist regime had been able to change its nature by some unknown miracle.

In truth, nothing justifies the dissolution of the American Communist Party, in our opinion. Browder's analysis of capitalism in the United States is not distinguished by a judicious application of Marxism-Leninism. The predictions regarding a sort of disappearance of class contradictions in the United States correspond in no wise to a Marxist-Leninist understanding of the situation.

As to the argument consisting of a justification of the Party's dissolution by the necessity of not taking direct part in the presidential elections, this does not withstand a serious examination. Nothing prevents a Communist Party from adapting its electoral tactics to the requirements of a given political situation. It is clear that American Communists were right in supporting the candidacy of President Roosevelt in the last elections, but it was not at all necessary for this to dissolve the Communist Party.

It is beyond doubt that if, instead of dissolving the Communist Party of the United States all had been done to intensify its activity in the sense of developing an ardent national and anti-fascist policy, it could very greatly have consolidated its position and considerably extended its political influence. On the contrary, formation of the Communist Political Association could not but trouble the minds and obscure the perspectives in the eyes of the working masses.

In France, under cover of Resistance unity, certain suggestions for the liquidation of the parties have been circulated, with more or less discretion, during the last months, but none among us has ever thought of taking such suggestions seriously. It is not by liquidating the Party that we would have served national unity. On the contrary, we are serving it by streng-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thening our Party. And as far as the American Communists are concerned, it is clear that their desire to serve the unity of their country and the cause of human progress places before them tasks which presuppose the existence of a powerful Communist Party.

After the Teheran decisions came the Yalta decisions which expressed the will of the Big Three to liquidate fascism in Germany and to help the liberated peoples to liquidate the remnants of fascism in the different countries.

It is scarcely necessary to recall that the material bases for fascism reside in the trusts, and the great objective of this war, the annihilation of fascism, can only be obtained to the extent in which the forces of democracy and progress do not shut their eyes to the economic and political circumstances which engendered fascism.

The American Communists have an especially important role to play in the struggle taking place between the progressive forces of the earth and the fascist barbarism. Without any doubt they would have been in a better position to play this role in the interests of their country and human progress if, instead of proceeding to dissolve their Party, they had done everything to strengthen it and make of it one of the elements of the assembling of the broad democratic masses of the United States for the final crushing of fascism, that shame of the 20th century. It would be useless to hide the fact that fascism has more or less concealed sympathisers in the United States, as it has in France and other countries.

The former Vice-President of the U.S., Henry Wallace, present Secretary of Commerce, said rightly that one cannot fight fascism abroad and tolerate at home the activity of powerful groups which intend to make peace "with a simple breathing spell between the death of an old tyranny and the birth of a new."

The Yalta decisions thwart these plans, but the enemies of liberty will not disarm of their free will. They will only retreat before the acting coalition of all the forces of democracy and progress.

And it is clear that if Comrade Earl Browder had seen, as a Marxist-Leninist, this important aspect of the problems facing liberty-loving peoples in this moment in their history, he would have arrived at a conclusion quite other than the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States.

Postscript

(*Since the above article went to press, the National Board of the C.P.A. have submitted a resolution approved by the National Committee, for consideration by an emergency Convention to meet July* 26. *The following is the sixth section of that resolution.*—Ed., L.M.)

We recognise that the future of the labour and progressive movements and therefore the role of the United States in world affairs will depend to no small extent upon the correctness of our Communist policy, our independent role and influence, our mass activities and organised strength.

That is why today we Communists must not only learn from our achievements in the struggle against fascism, but also from our weaknesses and errors. In the recent period, especially since January, 1944, these mistakes consisted in drawing a number of erroneous conclusions from the historic significance of the Teheran accord. Among these false conclusions was the concept that after the military defeat of Germany, the decisive sections of big capital would participate in the struggle to complete the destruction of fascism and would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

co-operate with the working people in the maintenance of post-war national unity. This illusion had no foundation in life, either in the class nature of finance capital, or in the post-war aims of the trusts and cartels which seek imperialist aggrandisement and huge profits at the expense of the people. This has been amply demonstrated by recent events.

This revision of Marxist-Leninist theory regarding the role of monopoly capital, especially after military victory, led to other erroneous conclusions, such as to Utopian economic perspectives and the possibility of achieving the national liberation of the colonial and dependent countries though arrangements between the great powers. It also led to tendencies to obscure the class nature of bourgeois democracy, to false concepts of social evolution and to minimising the independent and leading role of the working-class.

Furthermore, the changes we made in our form of Communist organisation, coming when they did and coupled with the above revisionist errors, could not but lead towards liquidating the independent and vanguard role of the Communist movement. Nor was the act of dissolution of the party required to carry out our correct election policy of support for President Roosevelt.

While the change from C.P. to C.P.A. did not result in a decline in membership (the 1945 membership enrolment of the C.P.A. showed a more than 25 per cent. increase, as compared with the 1944 enrolment figures of the C.P.), it is none the less true that the growth of the Communist movement among the industrial workers was undoubtedly retarded.

While a change in form or name of our Marxist organisation is not in itself a question of principle, it is a matter of principle, however, that the character of our Communist organisation, whatever its electoral status, must be that of the independent, Marxist party of the working-class. And this we must now fully guarantee in the programme, policies and activities of the Communist Political Association, pending whatever changes we shall make in the form and name of our Communist organisation and movement.

While correctly concentrating on our main wartime objective; namely, that of subordinating everything to win the war, to smash Nazi Germany and militarist Japan, our opportunist mistakes were abetted by an oversimplified and one-sided approach to our wartime tasks. These errors were also facilitated by non-labour, bourgeois influences which unconsciously affected some of our policies as we participated and functioned ever more actively in the broad camp of national unity. And these opportunist deviations were accentuated by our reluctance to constantly analyse and re-examine our policies and mass work in the spirit of Marxist self-criticism, especially the failure to draw our full membership into the discussion and determination of basic policy.

The opportunist errors which we were committing adversely influenced our work during the war, limited the effectiveness of our anti-fascist activities, and were tending to confuse and mislead the Communist and the progressive labour movement for the post-war period.

While we Communists were beginning to re-examine our post-war perspectives and to correctly react to some of the recent international developments, we were, however, readjusting ourselves too slowly to the new world developments, because we failed to understand the basic opportunist errors that had crept into our policies.

In this connection, therefore, we must recognise the important contributions which Comrade Foster made

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the struggle against opportunism. Likewise, we can appreciate the basic correctness of the sound fraternal, Marxist opinions expressed in the recent article of Jacques Duclos, one of the foremost leaders of the Communist Party of France.

In ascertaining the grave responsibility for the opportunist errors and mistakes committed in the recent period, it is necessary to state that while Comrade Browder, who was the foremost leader of the C.P.A., bears a proportionately greater share of responsibility than any other individual leader or member, the entire national leadership and in the first place, the National Board, must and does assume a heavy responsibility for these errors.

Messages from India, Burma and Ceylon

India

THE remarkable series of messages sent from India, Burma, Ceylon and other colonial countries (in connection with the General Election and particularly the Sparkbrook division) have a certain historic interest. A selection from them is given below:—

Mahatma Gandhi:—

Of course I know Palme Dutt both by name and fame. I do wish him success in his campaign.

Pandit Jawaharial Nehru

Having just come out of prison after nearly three years and being hustled and harassed, I am hardly in a position to issue messages, but I certainly wish Palme Dutt every success in his election. I have known him for many years and have admired his ability. Apart from the personal factor, his success has obviously also a certain symbolic value in the circumstances.

Girni Kamgar (Red Flag) Union:—

A resolution recognises "the fight between Palme Dutt and Amery as a fight between progressive Britain fighting for Indian independence against reactionary Tories trying to perpetuate Indian slavery," and ends by appealing to the British Labour Party to withdraw its candidate in favour of Dutt, "in the wider interest of British Labour and progressive movement and also in the interests of promoting better understanding between British and Indian people."

Inakanti Bose
(President of the All-India Trades Union Congress):—

Greetings and support to Rajani Palme Dutt for contesting Leopold Amery in the coming General Election in Britain. The black record that Amery holds as Secretary of State for India should have earned him impeachment instead of election to Parliament. Particularly in Bengal, his name is associated with the death of millions through famine, as it is his administration which is held directly responsible, even by the official Famine Commission for the terrible famine of 1943. It is under his regime that our national leaders, pledged to support the struggle against fascism, were put behind prison bars for demanding a National Government which alone could have effectively mobilised the entire Indian people behind the United Nations.

The deliberate policy of continuing the deadlock for the last three years can be charged against Amery.

While the forces of freedom are unleashed in different parts of the world today, it is British imperialism that stands in the way of Asiatic liberation and we expect British people to act up to their ideals of democracy and turn out lock, stock and barrel men of Amery's type who stand between free India and democratic Britain.

Without prejudice to our respective political views, I support Dutt for his bold stand in fighting Amery on the single issue of India and I hold that every vote cast in his favour is a vote not only for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indian freedom, but for British democracy as well.

A cable, received June 21, stated that a mammoth meeting, attended by over 20,000 people, the like of which has not been seen since August, 1942, called by the Communist Party in Delhi on Sunday, June 17, passed a resolution greeting the decision of R. P. Dutt to fight against Mr. Amery in the Sparkbrook Division of Birmingham. The Communist leader of Delhi presided at the meeting, which was attended by a large number of Congressmen. The resolution called the contest "Not a clash of two individuals, but of two diametrically opposed policies." Continuing, it said:—

Amery represents the die-hard Tories who want to keep India in slavery. Dutt represents the Labour and progressive forces in Britain who want freedom for India and the colonies.

Against the jailer of India stands the leader of the British Communists, the greatest campaigners for the release of prisoners and opening of negotiations with India's leaders.

The meeting wishes success to Dutt in the interests of abiding friendship between Britain and India.

The resolution ended with an appeal to Sparkbrook voters to vote for Dutt and to the Labour Party to withdraw its candidate and ensure Amery's defeat. The resolution was adopted unanimously with cries of: "We want Amery's defeat; we want Palme Dutt to win," etc., etc.

Bankim Chandra Mukherjee (General Secretary of the All-India Kisan Sabha):—

On behalf of eight Lakhs Kisans (800,000 peasants) organised in the All India Kisan Sabha, I appeal to the British and Indian electors of Sparkbrook to vote for Palme Dutt, who is opposing Mr. Amery in that constituency. Mr. Dutt's election fight against Amery is symbolic of the fight the Indian people are waging against the regime of political deadlock and repression which has meant famine, epidemics and ruination to the Indian peasants. Every honest Briton and every patriotic Indian who wants India to be free and prosperous, who wants friendly relations between our two countries, must go on record for Mr. Dutt and against India's jailer.

Sikh leaders' declaration;—

We are happy that our Comrade Rajani Palme Dutt is fighting Mr. Amery in this parliamentary election. Every vote cast for him is a vote against the jailers of India and for the release of Congress leaders and hundreds of veteran revolutionaries who have been rotting for years in prisons. We appeal to every Indian to support Dutt. We also appeal to every honest Briton to vote for Dutt and thus demonstrate that they want free, equal and friendly collaboration between our two great countries.

Baba Sohansingh Bhakna, Baba Visakha Singh, Baba Kesar Singh, Baba Bhag Singh Canadian, Sohan Singh Josh, M.L.A., chief whip of the Congress Assembly Party of the Punjab, Teja Singh Swatantra.

In addition messages were received from the following organisations:—

Trade Unions

Press Workers Union—Jhansi.
Textile Workers Union—Amalner.
Electrical and Mechanical Engineers Union—Bombay.
Municipal Workers Union—Juppulpore.
Sawmill Workers Union—Bombay.
Beedi Union—Tellicherry.
Weavers—Tellicherry.
Textile Workers—Bandera.
Municipality—Badera.
Andhra Regional Trade Union—Andhra.
Khandesh Workers Council—Khandesh.
Beedi Workers—Central Provinces and Berar.
Cotton Mill Workers Union—Ayyaputty.
Tannery Leather Workers—Cawnpore.
Building Trade Workers—Nagpur.
Shipyard Labour Union—Vizagapatam.
G.I.P. Railwayman's Union—Jhansi.

Peasant Associations

Chirrakal Taluk Kisan Sangha—Malabar.
District Peasant Organisation—Cuttack.
Mazdoor Union—Kashmir.
Ryots Association—Andhra Province.
Kisan Sabha—Sultanpur.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kisan Sabha—Katol.
Provincial Kisan Sabha—Bengal.
Kisan Council—Irikkur.
Ryots Association—Chipuralle.
District Kisan Sabha—Kurnool.
District Peasant Association—Anantapur.

Public Meetings, etc.

Public Meeting—Calicut.
Communist Party Committee—Malabar.
District Women's Association—Andra Province.
Congress Committee—Farrukhabad.
Public Meeting (C.P.)—Rajkot.
Public Meeting—Badagara.

Burma

Major-General Aung San, Commander-in-Chief of the Burma forces, 20,000 strong, which by its guerilla actions behind the Jap lines immensely speeded up the 14th Army advance from Mandalay to Rangoon, is also President of the Burma Anti-Fascist Freedom League. This League is composed of the Communist Party, the People's Revolutionary Party, the Fabian Party, Myothit Party, Arakan National Congress, Anti-Fascist Karen Organisation, the East Asia Youth League (with its 2 lakhs, i.e., 200,000 members, which is Burma's leading political organisation and led the local Burma forces). Together with Thakim Than Tun, secretary of the League, Aung San sent the following message:—

On behalf of the entire Burmese people, we greet Rajani Palme Dutt, unwavering fighter for Burmese and Indian freedom, and wish him victory in the election contest against Amery, the man responsible by his policy for the deadlock in India, for the Bengal famine, administrative chaos, and thus for the delay in the liberation of Burma from fascist Japan. We appeal to the people of Sparkbrook to give him every support and particularly to the Labour Party to withdraw its candidate, thus making sure of Amery's defeat and the defeat of Amery's Burmese policy, which, under the plea of administrative chaos, is denying freedom to the people who have fought and died for it.

Thakim Fo
(General Secretary of the Communist Party of Burma)—

We 2,000 members of the Burma Communist Party greet Dutt, standard-bearer of all colonial peoples struggling for freedom. We know his victory will be our victory, the victory of all decent progressive men in the world and victory over men like Amery, who justified Japan's first step of aggression in Asia, the logical end of which is the fascist enslavement of our country. We know, too, that Dutt's victory will mean the repudiation by the British people of the Amery policy in Burma, a policy of denying freedom to the people who have sacrificed their best to help the allied armies to liberate their country and who alone can rebuild Burma as a free, prosperous friend of the British people after the chaos left by the Japs.

We appeal to all the British electors in Sparkbrook to vote for Dutt and thus vote for an enduring friendship between Burma and Britain.

Ceylon

Ceylon National Congress

The working Committee of the Ceylon National Congress hopes that the General Election to the British Parliament will result in a victory for progressive forces over those of Conservative reaction.

Conservative policy towards Ceylon has always been based on continuing the political subjection of our country to Britain. The Congress, which stands for the freedom of Ceylon, naturally wishes to see the end of these unjust relations between the two countries. It wishes to see a new period in the relations between the peoples of Ceylon and Britain, based on mutual freedom and friendship.

Establishing such new relations will be an important contribution, not only to the happiness and prosperity of the peoples of Ceylon and Britain, but also to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the larger question of maintaining world peace and security, which cannot be firmly established as long as the colonial system remains.

The Working Committee is, therefore, interested in seeing that those forces in Britain, which stand for such a policy, win a majority in the coming General Election. In its opinion a victory of such forces is synonymous with the return of a Labour and progressive majority and the defeat of Conservative reactionaries.

The Sparkbrook election, where Mr. Amery is being contested by Mr. R. Palme Dutt, is, in the opinion of the Working Committee, more than a narrow party affair. Mr. Amery represents to the peoples of India and Ceylon the quintessence of imperialist domination. Mr. Dutt, on the other hand, is fighting on a policy which corresponds to their aspirations for national freedom and democratic advance. The defeat of Mr. Amery and the return of Mr. Dutt will be regarded by all subject peoples as an expression of the bona fides of the British people towards the peoples of the colonial Empire.

★ ★ ★

As a pendant to these messages may be printed the following letter:—

Ayot St. Lawrence,
Nr. Welwyn,
Herts.
June 25, 1945.

Dear Palme Dutt,

Although as one of the authors of the original PLAN OF CAMPAIGN FOR LABOUR I may claim to be a founder of the Labour Party I think it has blundered badly in putting up a Party candidate to oppose you in Sparkbrook. It has created a situation in which a vote for the Labour Party is a vote against Labour, a vote against India, a vote against Russia, and a vote for Imperialist Capitalism in the person of its most thorough-going prominent representative; for its only effect can be to secure a victory for him by splitting the Progressive vote, even if he fails to obtain a majority. A worse instance of "Our Party, right or wrong" or one more likely to effect its defeat, would be hard to find.

Mr. Amery is an exceptional and formidable opponent, and is in possession of the seat. To put up against him a commonplace competitor is to trifle with a very important occasion. He is the most uncompromising of all our Imperialists, and will have a walk-over against any opponent less conspicuously qualified. None of the Front Bench Labour men will take him on; they all have safer seats to contest: you are the only man with the scholarship and record of long service and uncompromising devotion to the interests of the nine tenths of the nation whose standing has any chance against his.

You call yourself a Communist: so do I: so would all the others if they understood that our practical British Communism has saved us in the war in the west, just as Russian Communism, which Russia learnt from England, has saved us in the east. I hope there will be enough good sense in Sparkbrook to see that what you have to say about it is plain common sense, and what Mr. Churchill is saying about it is arrant nonsense, like his pious protest against "violence" after spending £12,000,000 a day for five years in the most frightful form of violence in the history of mankind.

I hope you will win. All the political fools and gulls in Sparkbrook will vote against you; but every vote recorded for you will be a vote for intelligence, knowledge of the world, and essential righteousness. And so good luck to you.

G. BERNARD SHAW.

ON ACCOUNT OF THE GENERAL ELECTION THIS ISSUE IS UNAVOIDABLY LATE.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

Indian Problems

The Problem of Population by Gyan Chand. Oxford Pamphlets on India (No. 19).
Tariffs and Industry by John Matthai. Oxford Pamphlets on India (No. 20).
The Future of India by Penderel Moon. Pilot Press. 5*s*.

LIKE THEIR their predecessors in this series, the "Oxford" pamphlets make a valuable contribution to sober understanding of the complicated problems that face India. And unlike most of those who write about the intricacy of these problems, these Indian experts see them, not as experts to democratic advance, but as problems that can only be tackled, or even intelligently discussed, in the light of Indian freedom.

Professor Gyan Chand briefly dismisses current absurdities and false theories about the birth-rate. Whilst admitting that birth control in India today is made necessary by the social and economic set-up which perpetuates poverty and disease, the main stress of his argument is that the problem of population is *qualitative*, not a *quantitative* one. Restriction of population is no panacea for poverty; and poverty is the mortal disease from which India suffers. To overcome chronic want and disease, to ensure a happy and healthy population, requires a plan of social, economic and industrial development that will produce a manifold increase in the standard of living. "It (the problem) has to be treated as a problem of the remaking of a nation, and not merely a problem of numbers" . . . and "this cannot be done without the complete economic and political emancipation of the people."

Mr. Matthai equally insists upon the urgent need for industrial development. But only a National Government can rectify the ill-balanced economy by the judicious use of tariffs. In so doing, however, the author believes that India will in her own interest develop an international outlook and align her tariff policy as part of a world economic policy.

Mr. Penderel Moon was a member of the Indian Civil Service and, his publishers claim, he can therefore speak from first-hand experience. There is no need to question the sincerity of his distaste for the results of British rule or his sympathies for India's national aspirations. Moreover, his practical proposals for economic advance and social reform are excellent. But, unlike Professor Chand and Mr. Matthai, he sees all the problems and difficulties, not as arguments for freedom, but as stumbling blocks, sources of possible anarchy, bogeys to make even the most progressive Civil Servant lie awake at night. For all his good intentions and his first-hand official experience, he has succeeded in remaining curiously out of touch with the outlook and the mode of thought of India's great peoples' movements.

MICHAEL CARRITT.

U.S.S.R. Geography

Maurice Lovell : "Landsmen and Seafarers" (Harrap & Co., 7*s*6*d*) (64 pp.).
Pictorial Charts Unit: "U.S.S.R. in Maps and Diagrams" (Pictorial Charts, 21*s* set; 3*s*6*d* each).

MR. LOVELL'S book is among the very best of the many published since June, 1941, to explain the Soviet Union to the British public. Even its chapters about Soviet geography and climate are lively, personal, full of incident. The chapters on the history, social life and economy of the U.S.S.R.—full of suggestive and well-selected contrasts with the development of Britain—are most readable and instructive; so is his concluding section on Anglo-Russian relations through the centuries. Pictorial "Isotype" charts, bringing out the different lines of Soviet and British development, are startlingly clear.

This book by a former Reuter's correspondent in Moscow—in spite of one or two passages which some LABOUR MONTHLY readers would put otherwise—can be warmly recommended.

"U.S.S.R. in Maps and Diagrams" is a praiseworthy effort to help the teacher and lecturer. It is a pity that an excellent pictorial chart on collective farms, containing useful material on allocation of their yearly proceeds, is marred by the absence of any feature clearly distinguishing them from State farms, e.g., individually owned livestock, barns, etc., "National region" for "national area" (on the Arctic seaboard) is a slip in two charts which should be corrected.

Q.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in June :—£47 1s. 5d.
Amount received in July :—£70 4s. 7d.

£117 6s. 0d.

During the past two months the calls of the Election have overshadowed individual needs, and rightly so. Now, however, our efforts must be redoubled. That £100 each month is still needed: in fact, it is essential if the LABOUR MONTHLY is to "carry on the good work."

OVER £82 TO MAKE UP

It's not just a matter of simple arithmetic—it means eighty-two pounds' worth of marxist understanding and enthusiasm.

This August issue has been delayed to enable you to read comments on the General Election results. Thus, there is one week less in which to send in your contributions to the September Donations List. WILL YOU RUSH THEM IN ?

	£	s.	d.
G. K.		10	0
F. M. R.		10	0
T. R. Macfarlane	1	12	6
P. Andrews	1	0	0
P. Wallis		2	6
J. Barker			6
The Bacon Family		5	0
L'Humanite		2	0
E. McCallum		5	0
H. A. B.	5	0	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
K. M. G., Ex-Rhodesia		2	6
E. S. Stiff		2	6
V. R. Pearson		2	6
G. Sargent		5	0
J. A. Smith		4	0
E. Bogomaz		13	0
A. Neuwirth		5	0
C. G. Taff		13	0
A. Singer	1	10	0
T. D. Culbert		3	0
G. Lewis		3	6
A. Hazlewood		3	0
T. Chapman		3	0
J. McLanachan		13	0
R. Green		3	0
H. F. Westney		13	0
H. W. Hall		3	0
J. King		3	0
P. Mayer		4	0
J. McNaught		3	0
Old Age Pensioner		2	6
Mrs. Brierley		3	0
G. J. Owen		1	6
L'Humanite		3	0
J. Fraser		13	0
E. Whitworth		10	0
F. Lister		13	0
W. G. Pendrill		3	0
R. C. Abbatt		13	0
S. Walker		3	0
D. E. Thompson		3	0
D. R. Morgan		3	0
H. S. M.		2	6
Airman's Reply		10	0
S. Morrissy		12	0
D. Gay		3	0
P. A. Sloan	1	0	0
A. Tidman		3	0
Hebrew Writer, Palestine		3	0
D. G. Parker		5	0
W. Wallace	1	0	0
A. G. Spencer		3	0
D. W. D.		10	0
S. B.		3	0
A Sympathiser		10	0
J. E. Brown		6	0
J. Purton	1	0	0
Mr. & Mrs. Humphries		2	6
P. T. George		3	3
J. W. Tait		3	0
C. Whyte Smith		3	0
R. Burgess		2	0
Forces, per D. A. H.		0	0
J. Rattray		2	6
Subtenanto		2	6
J. McFarlane		1	0
N. M. Scott		3	0
J. Sharott		3	0
J. M. Burnett		13	0
F. M. R.		3	0
A. N. S.		13	0
G. Robson		5	0
J. George		3	0
M. Paton		10	0
M. Bromberg		3	0
D. H. Strathern & Friends	1	10	0
S. Clegg		5	0
D. Rees		10	0
A. G. Neville		7	0
S. Osgathorpe		1	0
A. E. Portbury		13	0
Office Worker		4	6
E. J. Stout		5	0
S. Mill		10	0
K. Harding		3	0
Smoke		10	0
S. Perry		2	0
R. Sleep		2	6
J. L. Pinder		12	0
E. W.		11	0
A. Wall		5	0
Sgt. Polly	1	0	0
J. M.		2	6
J. Allison		3	0
P. J. Wallis		3	0
J. B. Hodgson		3	0
L. Newman		3	0
Eric and Norah		10	0
M. Thomas		6	0
C. Osmond	1	4	0
H. Williams	1	0	0
E. Belsey		2	6
V.A.D.		5	0
W. Lakin Smith		2	6
B. A. Magnuson		6	4
J. Pack		3	0
J. Macdonald		3	0
D. Livingstone		2	6
D. Parker Rhodes		13	0
Director	2	0	0
T. Chapman		2	0
F. Renouf		5	0
A. Paterson		3	0
F. Stehr		5	0
K. B. Kay		5	0
J. S. Houston	1	0	0
W. Burbridge		2	6
Lower Morden D.G.		4	0
M. A. Kingdom		10	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
J. P. Ellis		10	0
Eight of the Boys		10	0
J. Rattray		2	6
Subtenanto		2	6
Anon, Whitchurch		1	0
M. Crowley		3	0
W. Sibthorpe		3	0
N. Kelly		10	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
T. Murray		3	0
V. S. Dodwell		5	0
R. Stubbs			6
L'Humanite		2	0
F. Hughes		3	0
Q. Z.		12	0
The Bacon Family		5	0
A. F. Perrin		3	0
D. Oakeshott		5	0
Learner		2	0
E. MacCallum		5	0
L. D. Kitson		1	6
R. Pearson		2	6
A. E., R.A.O.C.		10	0
W. Madison	1	0	0
E. Reckitt	1	0	0
Radio Mech., R.E.M.E.		10	0
D. Parvin		13	0
I. Martin		5	0
B. Babcock		7	6
H. Loshak		3	0
J. J. Trott		6	0
J. Wallis		2	6
T. H. Coe		2	6
K. M. G., Ex-Rhodesia		2	6
J. Conway		1	6
Old Age Pensioner		2	6
S. Morrissy		12	0
Anon		3	6
V. Smith	1	0	0
F. M. R.		5	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now available

THE STRUGGLE FOR FRENCH DEMOCRACY

Cyril Claydon 5s.

THE CIVIL SERVICE & THE PEOPLE

R. W. Rawlings 7s. 6d.

ON CAPITAL

Frederick Engels Reprint, 5s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 7s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s., from LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3s. a year inclusive of postage.

BOUND VOLUMES

Enquiries often come to the office for the older volumes of the LABOUR MONTHLY. Of the years set forth below, there are a few copies still available at the prices mentioned :—

	each				each		
1925	£2	2	0	1935	£1	1	0
1926	£1	15	0	1937	£1	1	0
1927	£1	10	0	1938	£1	1	0
1928	£1	10	0	1939	£1	1	0
1929	£1	10	0	1941		15	0
1931	£1	5	0	1942		15	0
1932	£1	5	0	1943		15	0
1934	£1	1	0		—		

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED